



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/647,461	5/3/96	Kevin McDermott	None

EXAMINER	
Mack Haynes	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2215	08/647,461
DATE MAILED: 7	

### EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kevin McDermott <i>Kevin McDermott</i>	(3) Matthew Spark	STEPHEN F. HUSAR PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 346
(2) Stephen Husar	(4) Mack Haynes	
	(5) Joseph Williams <i>Joseph Williams</i>	

Date of interview 1/21/98

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: Actual models of applicant's light design. Applicant retained possession of the models

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: Bitner (US 2224178) Application #'s 08/642,447 631,821 643213 642546  
642661 647461 647459 628288

Identification of prior art discussed: Bitner (US 2224178) ; Sakai et al. (US 4698730); Harris (US 2254961)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the difference between the parabola shape of Sakai vs. instant application. Applicant agreed to rework claims to distinguish the structure over prior art. The issue of double patenting may be overcome by the current amendments or through a terminal disclaimer. Applicant did clearly distinguish instant applications over Sakai. Applicant will submit sup. amendments within two weeks

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

*Stephen F. Husar*  
Examiner's Signature